



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/839,714	04/19/2001	Bo-In Lin	L&C2k01(09 / 839,714)	2769
7590 05/16/2006			EXAMINER	
Bo-In Lin 13445 Mandoli Drive Los Altos Hills, CA 94022			GAUTHIER, GERALD	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2614	

DATE MAILED: 05/16/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/839,714

**Applicant(s)**

LIN, BO-IN

**Examiner**

Gerald Gauthier

**Art Unit**

2614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 February 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. **Claim(s) 2, 4-6, 10-14 and 16-22** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rogers et al (US 5,946,386) in view of Meier et al. (US 5,596,633).

Regarding **claim(s) 2, 17, 19, 20 and 22**, regarding "a message routing means.....of destinations", Rogers discloses on column 13 lines 13-39 call routing.

Regarding "a database.....destination number", Rogers discloses on column 3 line 16-20. The "one number " of Rogers is the claimed "unified access number" (one number to send voice, fax and data calls).

Rogers also discloses on column 9 line 1-11 call management database includes caller identification information.

As Rogers discloses on column 3 lines 16-20 the "one number" is used to identify the caller.

Therefore, the "one number" must be included in the call management database.

Rogers discloses on column 2 line 21-35 VIP rules for transferring calls (reads on the claimed "forwarding destination number"). Since the call management database includes the VIP rules (of transferring calls), the forwarding destination numbers must be included in the call management database.

Regarding "said database further.....list of callers", Rogers discloses on column 25 line 56-60 the called party uses call control window (claimed "user interface") to edit the primary caller ID database (of the call management databases).

Rogers discloses on item 716 Fig. 7abc "updating said database for modifying first forwarding destination number".

Rogers fails to disclose "a video camera.....for automatically detecting a user's presence".

However, Meier teaches a video camera disposed at a location associated with one of said forwarding destination numbers for automatically detecting a user's presence at said location for activating said video camera to automatically send a signal to said unified access management center for updating said database for modifying said first forwarding destination number (column 4, lines 21-24 and column 2, lines 51-65 and column 3, lines 20-30).

It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Rogers in combination with Grimes to have a user presence detecting means is

a video camera” as taught by Meier such that the modified system of Rogers in combination with Grimes would be able to support the user conveniences of using a video camera to detect presence.

Regarding **claims 4 and 5**, Rogers discloses on column 37 lines 47-51 the user may change his “one number”. Rogers also teach on column 44 lines 19-21 the system user may call his own “one number” and enter a password for access authorization. This system of Rogers must register the system user in order to verify the entered password. The entering a password reads on the claimed “logging”.

Regarding **claim 6**, Rogers discloses on column 3 lines 15-20 the “one number” is single unique telephone number to each user. Since the VIP rule of forwarding a call is based on the identity of the calling party (the “one number”), there must be a second forwarding destination number associated with a second caller.

Regarding **claim 10**, Rogers discloses on column 38 lines 47-48 rules of forwarding sequence of a FAX.

Regarding **claim 11**, Rogers discloses on column 38 lines 44-46 rules of time-dependent forwarding sequence.

Regarding **claim 12**, the sequential forwarding processes (as rejections stated in claims 10 and 11 above) disclose by Rogers are based on rules stored in the call management database. The sequential forwarding taught by Rogers et al must be enabled by the database.

Regarding **claim 13**, Rogers discloses on column 22 lines 16-26 real-time control of calls, call transfers and call forwarding. The "real-time control" of Rogers et al reads on the claimed "simultaneous".

Regarding **claim 14**, Rogers discloses on column 22 line 18 e-mail is also one of message types supported by the Roger's system.

Regarding **claims 16, 18 and 21**, Rogers discloses on column 3 line 44-48 applying priority to each call (reads on claimed "forwarding sequence of each of said callers").

4. **Claim 1** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rogers in view of Meier, and further in view of Yamaguchi (US 6,499,055).

Regarding **claim(s) 1**, all rejections as stated in claim 2 above apply.

Rogers fails to disclose "Unified access management center.....lists of callers". However, Junkin teaches on column 2 line 65 to column 3 line 17 editing a database via an HTML-based internet browser.

It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Rogers in combination with Meier to have the "Unified access management center.....lists of callers" as taught by Junkin such that the modified system of Rogers would be able to support the system users convenience of to edit database by using an internet-web user interface.

Regarding "unified access management.....number to said database". The rejections as stated in claim 4 apply.

Regarding "user access control.....editing said database". The rejections as stated in claim 5 apply.

Rogers fails to disclose "unified access management.....(e-mail) message". However, the rejections as stated in claim 7 apply.

It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Rogers to have the "unified access management.....(e-mail) message" as taught by Yamaguchi such that the modified system of Rogers would be able to support the system users convenience of receiving and processing telephone messages as email messages.

5. **Claim 7** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rogers in view of Meier as applied to **claim 4** above, and further in view of Yamaguchi.

Rogers in combination with Meier as stated in **claim 4** above fails to disclose "unified access.....(e-mail) message".

However, Yamaguchi teaches on column 4 line 4-12 a WWW server for receiving and processing e-mails.

It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Rogers in view of Meier to have the "unified access.....(e-mail) message" as taught by Yamaguchi such that the modified system of Rogers would be able to support the web site to the system users.

6. **Claims 8 and 9** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rogers in view of Meier as applied to **claim 2** above.

Rogers in combination with fail to disclose "location for disposing the user presence detection means".

However, "Official Notice" is taken that disposing the user presence detection means in a building where associates with a forwarding destination number and the user may possibly present is old and well known to one skilled in the art.

It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Rogers in combination with Meier to have the locations of a building and a



vehicle such that the modified system of Rogers would be able to support the system users conveniences of using the presence detection means at various places.

7. **Claim 15** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rogers in view of Meier as applied to **claim 2** above, and further in view of Porter (US 6,282,270).

Rogers in combination with Meier fail to disclose "database further comprising.....destination URL".

However, Porter teaches on Abstract that voice messages are forwarded from the WWW server to its client. The URL of the www client must be stored on the system.

It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Rogers in combination with Meier to have the "database further comprising.....destination URL" as taught by Porter such that the modified system of Rogers would be able to support the URL to the system users.

### ***Response to Arguments***

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to **claim(s) 1, 2 and 4-22** have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gerald Gauthier whose telephone number is (571) 272-7539. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang can be reached on (571) 272-7547. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2614

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
**GERALD GAUTHIER**  
**PATENT EXAMINER**

Gerald Gauthier  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2614

GG  
May 11, 2006